

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please delete original figure 14 and replace it with a revised figure 14 attached hereto. The figure has been amended to show the centerline "CL". No new matter has been added.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favourable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Examiner's Action claims 1, 3-13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner has taken the position that there is no support for the top cutting angle varying along the width of the tooth and increasing as it approaches the centre. The Examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection in view of the following comments.

The Applicants have revised the description of figure 14 to include a centre line and have amended the text associated therewith. It is respectfully submitted that both the amendment to the text and the drawing would have clearly been known to anyone skilled in the art who had read the application as originally filed in the context of the drawings as originally filed. Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

The Examiner is directed to pages 8 lines 18 through page 10 line 14 wherein the features of the tooth and dimple are described in detail with regard to the conical dimple and the hemispherical dimple. The hemispherical dimple is shown in figures 5, 7 and 9 and the conical dimple is shown in figures 6, 8 and 10. When taking the description of the dimple together with the front view and a generally vertical cross section and a generally horizontal cross section it is respectfully submitted that it would be clear to anyone skilled in the art that the top cutting angle 32 shown in figure 7 and 8 would clearly vary over its width and that it would be maximum at the centre. Figures 12 and 13 described on page 11 lines 19 through page 12 line 5 shows a hemispherical dimple similar to those in figures 5, 7 and 9 but with the sides truncated. Figures 14 and 15 described on page 12 line 6 through 9 show a scallop shaped dimple.

By way of example, attached hereto as Exhibit "A" are three cross-sectional views of Fig. 14 showing the change in top cutting angle 32. Exhibit "B" is a copy of Fig. 14 showing where the cross-sections are taken.

The three figures are each cross sections of the tooth and a portion of the blade of the present invention shown in the application as filed in figures 14 and 15. The sections are taken at various depths through the width of the tooth and blade and are in planes that are parallel to the central plane of the blade. In these three figures, the top cutting angle is established as the angular difference between the dimple line (extending from and tangent to the dimple leading edge plane) and the tooth line (extending from the front plane of the tooth).

Section A-A is taken at a depth of half the width of the tooth and blade (the same as figure 15 itself.) This figure shows the top cutting angle (the angle between the two extending lines) at its maximum and occurring at the centre of the width of the blade. Section B-B is taken at a depth less than the depth of the top figure, approximately one third the way through the width of the tooth and blade. Additionally, this figure shows the top cutting angle as being less than its maximum. The top cutting angle is less here than in the top figure since the dimple line in this case is extending from a portion of the dimple leading edge that has a reduced slope relative to the tooth line. Section C-C is taken just slightly into the width of the tooth and blade, approximately one sixth the way through the width of the tooth and blade. This figure shows the top cutting angle as being less again than figure B-B. The top cutting angle is reduced as the dimple line in this case is very close to being the same as the tooth line, the dimple line and the tooth line are almost parallel.

It is respectfully submitted that these three sections taken together clearly illustrate how the top cutting angle varies from a minimum at the lateral sides of the tooth to a maximum at the middle of the width of the tooth. Further it is respectfully submitted that anyone skilled in the art when viewing the drawings in light of the text would clearly

know that the cutting angle varies along the width.

Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that the application as amended meets all of the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph.

In the Examiner's Action claims 1, 3-13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as failing to provide an antecedent for "the centre". In view of the above amendments it is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended now meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-13 and 17 as being anticipated by Standal (US 2,972,364). The Examiner is requested to reconsider the rejection in view of the above amendments and the following comments. However, the Examiner has agreed that a line defining the shape of the centre of the dimple has a steeper upper slope than a line that defines an outer edge of the dimple when lines are parallel to each other. The Examiner is requested to reconsider the rejection in light of the above amendments and the following arguments.

The applicant has amended claim 1 to further define the top cutting angle and a dimple line and a tooth line that help to show the variation of the angle along the width. Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended clearly distinguishes over Standal and therefore claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon is patentable.

Applicant submits that the amendments to the application are to more clearly and succinctly recite and claim the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added by these amendments and all the amendments are supported by the original specification as a whole.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, which is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/16/2004

By: 

Ralph A. Dowell
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 26,868
DOWELL & DOWELL, P.C.
2111 Eisenhower Avenue
Suite 406
Alexandria, Virginia
(703) 415-2555

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO.: 13744 (253-009-P)